REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, and 14-19 are present in this application, claims 16 and 17 being amended and claims 18 and 19 being added by way of the present amendment. The amended and new claims are supported by the non-limiting disclosure of, for example, page 42, lines 20-26. No question of introduction of new matter is believed to be raised by the amended and new claims.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 1, 7, 14-15 are rejected over U.S. 7,194,196 (Yamamoto et al.) and U.S. 5,990,955 (Koz), and claims 16 and 17 are rejected over Yamamoto et al. further in view of U.S. 6,296,187 (Shearer).

In claims 1 and 7, the playback unit is configured to play back the contents and expansion information in synchronism with each other. Claims 1 and 7 also recite that each of the segmented memory spaces of a storage unit stores a plurality of pieces of segmented expansion information which form a first type of expansion information when a first type of expansion information is to be stored, and the segmented memory spaces of the storage unit are integrated to store a second type of expansion information when the second type of expansion information is to be stored. The Office Action finds Yamamoto et al. to not disclose the segmented memory spaces. Also, the Office Action (on pages 3-4) misstates the claim language, finding Yamamoto et al. to teach a storage unit for storing expansion information on the basis of "a type of information," where the "information" corresponds to the video, audio and subpicture data. Claims 1 and 7 recite a storage unit configured to store the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit in accordance with a type of the expansion information. The Office Action has not identified the storage unit of claims 1 and 7 in Yamamoto et al.

The Office Action looks to <u>Koz</u> for the teachings missing in <u>Yamamoto et al.</u> The contents and expansion information are played back in synchronism with each other. Therefore, storing expansion information varies from type to type. For example, the pieces of a first type of expansion information which are acquired in sequence in accordance with a playback of contents are input and output using each of segmented memory spaces alternately. Pieces of a second type of expansion information which are acquired together before a playback of contents are all input using integrated segmented memory spaces, and then output in accordance with the playback of contents.

<u>Koz</u> simply discloses a technique of storing video bit stream data by FIFO A and FIFO B. As described in column 8, lines 40-48, the video buffer may be implemented as FIFO A and FIFO B. In other words, it does not disclose any technique of varying a storing method according to a data type for a synchronous playback. <u>Yamamoto et al.</u> similarly does not disclose the above technique. Moreover, the Office Action does not explain how or why a FIFO video buffer as taught by <u>Koz</u> would be used as the audio buffer in <u>Yamamoto et al.</u>, identified in the Office Action as corresponding to the second unit storing the expansion information. The Office Action also does not explain how the FIFO of <u>Koz</u> discloses a storage unit configured to store the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit in accordance with a type of the <u>expansion information</u>.

Both <u>Yamamoto et al.</u> and <u>Koz</u> fail to disclose the storage unit of claims 1 and 7. There is also insufficient basis provided in the Office Action to modify <u>Yamamoto et al.</u> to include the FIFO of <u>Koz</u> to store the expansion information. Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over a combination of <u>Yamamoto et al.</u> and <u>Koz</u>.

Amended claims 16 and 17 and new claims 18 and 19 recite that a playback (synchronous playback) of contents and expansion information is caused to pause when acquisition (downloading) of the expansion information is delayed. This pause can prevent

8

the drawback in which the expansion information is lost and only the contents are played back. In other words, a latency time for downloading is required, but the contents and the expansion information can be played back in synchronism with each other even though acquisition of the expansion information is delayed. Yamamoto et al. and Shearer do not disclose an apparatus as recited in claims 16 and 18 having a playback unit which causes a playback of the contents and the expansion information to pause when acquisition of the expansion information is delayed, a method as recited in claim 17 and 19 where the playback unit causes a playback of the contents and the expansion information to pause when acquisition of the expansion information is delayed.

Claims 16-19 of the present application are patentable over the cited prior art and therefore in condition for allowance.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870

Carl E. Schlier
Registration No. 34,426
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)